UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

l	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/813,250	03/30/2004	Michael A. Schultz	108524	4825
			03/30/2004 Michael A. Schultz  12/22/2006 TELLECTUAL PROPERTY INC ES RIVE IL STOP AB/2B IJ 07962  RIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE	EXAMINER	
PATENT SERVICES 101 COLUMBIA DRIVE		DOUGLAS, JOHN CHRISTOPHER			
		MAIL STOP AB/2B	03/30/2004 Michael A. Schultz  12/22/2006 ELLECTUAL PROPERTY INC S RIVE L STOP AB/2B 1 07962  OD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	MORRISTOW	MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962		1764	
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
_	3 MO	NTHS	12/22/2006	PAP	ER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/813,250	SCHULTZ ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John C. Douglas	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 October 2006</u> .						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1,2,9,10,12-22,25 and 26</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-8,11,23,24 and 27</u> is/are rejected.	,— , , , — , , ,					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)		•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1764

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges the response filed on 10/18/2006 containing amendments to the claims and remarks.

Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12-22, 25, and 26.

Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection(s) under the Ognisty have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Rice (US 6395950).

A new rejection follows:

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1764

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 27, 3-8, 11, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsybulevskiy in view of Bal, Rice (US 6395950), and Wessels
- 5. With respect to claims 27, 3 and 4, Tsybulevskiy discloses where a diesel stream containing sulfoxides is contacted with a zeolite adsorbent to produce a hydrocarbon stream having a reduced concentration of sulfoxides (see Tsybulevskiy, paragraphs 2, 16, and 26). Tsybulevskiy does not disclose where the adsorbent is contacted with a desorbent to produce a desorbent containing the sulfur compounds and an adsorbent having a reduced content of the sulfur compounds, does not disclose where the adsorbent with reduced sulfur is contacted with a hydrocarbon stream containing sulfur, and does not disclose fractionating the desorbent containing sulfur compounds to obtain a desorbent with reduced sulfur, does not disclose a split-shell fractionation.

However, Bal discloses desorbing sulfur compounds from an adsorbent and treating the desorbent to remove sulfur from the desorbent (see Bal, column 1, line 65 –

Art Unit: 1764

column 2, line 8 and claim 1). Bal also discloses recycling the desorbent to the desorbing step (see Bal, column 1, lines 43-53).

Bal discloses that the desorbent is used to regenerate the adsorbent (see Bal, column 1, lines 60-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the process of Tsybulevskiy to include desorbing sulfur compounds from an adsorbent and treating the desorbent to remove sulfur from the desorbent in order to regenerate the adsorbent.

Also, it would have been obvious to contact the regenerated adsorbent with a hydrocarbon stream so that the adsorbent can remove sulfur from the hydrocarbon stream.

In addition, Wessels discloses the use of n-hexane as a purge to sweep out hydrocarbons from the adsorbent (see Wessels, column 1, lines 21-27). Wessels also discloses where the n-hexane purge is fractionated to produce an n-hexane overhead fraction that is recycled for use as purge gas (see Wessels, column 2, lines 10-23). Also, Wessels discloses where the n-hexane purge is fractionated to produce an n-hexane overhead fraction that is recycled for use as purge gas (see Wessels, column 2, lines 10-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the process of Tsybulevskiy to include the use of n-hexane as a purge in order to sweep out hydrocarbons from the adsorbent.

Art Unit: 1764

Also, Rice discloses a fractionation zone with a vertical partition (see Rice, column 18, lines 23-45).

Rice discloses that such a distillation column with a vertical partition reduces capital costs as well as utility costs when compared to a traditional distillation column (see Rice, column 16, lines 26-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the process of Tsybulevskiy in view of Bal and Wessels to include a fractionation zone with a vertical partition in order to save on capital costs and utility costs.

- 6. With respect to claim 5, Tsybulevskiy discloses an absorbent that has an adsorption capacity of 0.62 wt% for a sulfoxide (see Tsybulevskiy, example 11, Table 4).
- 7. With respect to claim 6, Tsybulevskiy discloses where the adsorption contacting step is conducted at temperatures in the range of 10to 40 degrees C and pressures in the range of 300 to 6000 kPa (3 to 60 bars) (see Tsybulevskiy, paragraph 48).
- 8. With respect to claim 7, Bal discloses where the desorbent is introduced at temperatures between about 27 degrees C to about 400 degree C (see Bal, column 3, lines 21-25).
- 9. With respect to claim 8, Bal discloses where the desorbent is toluene (see Bal, column 3, lines 46-51).
- 10. With respect to claims 23, and 24, Tsybulevskiy discloses where a hydrocarbon stream containing sulfoxides is contacted with a zeolite adsorbent to produce a

. 1764

Art Unit: 1764

hydrocarbon stream having a reduced concentration of sulfoxides (see Tsybulevskiy, paragraphs 2 and 26). Bal discloses desorbing sulfur compounds from an adsorbent and treating the desorbent to remove sulfur from the desorbent (see Bal, column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 8 and claim 1).

Bal discloses that the desorbent is used to regenerate the adsorbent (see Bal, column 1, lines 60-65). Also, Bal discloses recycling the desorbent to the desorbing step (see Bal, column 1, lines 43-53). In addition, Wessels discloses the use of n-hexane as a purge to sweep out hydrocarbons from the adsorbent (see Wessels, column 1, lines 21-27).

Also, it would have been obvious to contact the regenerated adsorbent with a hydrocarbon stream so that the adsorbent can remove sulfur from the hydrocarbon stream.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant also argues that the purge stream and the desorbent stream are separate and distinct and have different compositions. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the purge stream and the desorbent stream are separate and distinct and have different compositions) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 1764

11. Applicant also argues that there is no motivation to combine Wessels. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, then-hexane purge gas of Wessels is useful to sweep hydrocarbons from the adsorbent.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John C. Douglas whose telephone number is 571-272-1087. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn A. Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JCD

12/19/2006

Mun